



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,585	03/15/2004	Jose Madeira De Freitas Garcia	G&C 30566.319-US-01	1655

55895 7590 07/06/2007
GATES & COOPER LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER

ORR, HENRY W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/06/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/800,585

Applicant(s)

GARCIA ET AL.

Examiner

Henry Orr

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 3/15/2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to applicant's amendment dated 4/26/2007.
2. Claims 1-33 are pending in the case.
3. Claims 1, 12 and 23 are independent claims.

Terminal Disclaimer

4. The terminal disclaimer filed on 4/26/2007 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application, which would extend beyond the expiration date of any patent granted on Application Serial Nos. 10/800,786 and 10/800,877 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Applicant's Response

5. In Applicant's response dated 4/26/2007, applicant has amended the following:
 - a) Specification
 - b) Claims 1, 10-12, 21-23, 32 and 33

Based on Applicant's amendments and remarks, the following objections and rejections previously set forth in Office Action dated 1/09/2007 are withdrawn:

- a) Objection to Specification
- b) 35 U.S.C. 101 Rejection to claims 23-33.
- c) 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd Rejection to claims 1-33.
- d) Double Patenting Rejection to claims 1-33.

Drawings

6. Figures 1 and 2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 1-3, 12-14 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonney et al. (hereinafter "Bonney"), U.S. Patent No. 6,339,439 B1, in view of Love et al. (hereinafter "Love"), U.S. Publication No. 2004/0177089.**

Claim 1:

Bonny teaches a graphic program such as a computer aided design application program (see abstract). **(claim 1; i.e., performing one or more functions of a Sheet Set Manager in the graphics program)** Examiner interprets the computer aided

design application program to be capable of functioning as a Sheet Set Manager (see abstract).

Bonney teaches *"Drawings, in general, may include many details of the models such as, but not limited, alternate views, section views, detail views of certain aspects of each of the models"* (see col. 1 lines 26-30). **(claim 1; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager manages a one or more Sheet Sets, each of the Sheet Sets comprises a collection of zero or more Sheets and Subsets of the Sheets, each of the Sheets comprises a drawing, layout or view, and the Sheet Set Manager manages one or more different views for the Sheets.)** Examiner considers the drawings to be a set of drawing sheets and the section views to be subsets of the sheets.

Bonney fails to expressly teach presenting a user with a list of views defined in a Sheet set and the user placing a view from the list onto a Sheet.

However, Love teaches a user can select a view from a list of views and display the drawing ("sheet") containing the selected view (see par. 58). **(claim 1; i.e., wherein the function comprises an Automatic View Creation, such that the Sheet Set Manager presents a user with a list of the views defined in the Sheet Set and the user places a view from the list onto a Sheet to invoke the Automatic View Creation).**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to manage the views of the drawings generated by Bonney's computer aided program with the list of views as taught by Love to provide the benefit of an effective identification of separate views in a drawing (see Love; par. 2, par. 7).

Claim 2:

Bonney fails to expressly teach re-defining the boundaries of the views after creation.

However, Love teaches *"the boundary is a bounding rectangle, the step of dividing the boundary to define a plurality of view areas comprising splitting the bounding rectangle to define a plurality of view rectangles"* (see par. 21-23). **(claim 2; i.e., wherein boundaries for the views are re-defined after creation.)** Examiner considers the boundary of the rectangle view as already created. Then the boundary of the rectangle view is split to define a plurality of view rectangles, which is considered re-defining the boundaries with the plurality view rectangles.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identify the views in the drawings generated by Bonney's computer aided program using the redefining method as taught by Love to provide the benefit of reducing costs by being able to retrieve drawings of existing components from a database of drawings in a computer aided design system (see Love; p. 2 par. 2).

Claim 3:

Bonney teaches *"each sheet illustrates a certain detail of a model"* (see col. 1 lines 32-33). **(claim 3; i.e., wherein each of the views is associated with a viewport)** Examiner considers the illustration of the certain detail of a model to be associated with a viewport because according to the applicant a viewport is a bounded area that

Art Unit: 2176

displays some portion of the model space of the model (see p. 7 lines 14-15).

Therefore, the certain detail of a model would be an example of a bounded area that is displaying a portion of the model space of the model.

Claims 12-14:

Claims 12, 13 and 14 are directed towards an apparatus and are substantially encompassed in method claims 1, 2 and 3 respectively; therefore the apparatus claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 1, 2 and 3 above.

Claims 23-25:

Claims 23, 24, and 25 are directed towards manufacture claims and are substantially encompassed in method claims 1, 2 and 3, respectively; therefore the manufacture claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 1, 2 and 3 above.

9. Claims 4, 15 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonney in view of Love as cited above, in further view of Song, U.S. Published Application No. 2003/0031380 A1.

Claim 4:

Neither Bonney nor Love expressly teaches representing the view with a thumbnail preview image.

However, Song's Figure 7 illustrates a thumbnail pane that shows each possible view represented by a thumbnail preview image (see abstract, par. 44). **(claim 4; i.e., wherein each of the views is represented by a thumbnail preview image displayed by the Sheet Set Manager.)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to manage the views of the drawings generated by Bonney's computer aided program with the list of views as taught by Love and to display a thumbnail pane of the views as taught by Song to provide the benefit of allowing the user to visualize all the possible views of a drawing image at once (see Love; par. 2, par. 7) (Song; abstract). Thus, utilizing the real estate of the display screen efficiently.

Claim 15:

Claim 15 is directed towards an apparatus and is substantially encompassed in method claim 4, respectively; therefore the apparatus claim is rejected under the same rationale as method claim 4 above.

Claim 26:

Claim 26 is directed towards a manufacture claim and is substantially encompassed in method claim 4, respectively; therefore the manufacture claim is rejected under the same rationale as method claim 4 above.

10. Claims 5-11, 16-22 and 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonney in view of Love as cited above, in further view of Kawai, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0043177.

Claim 5:

Neither Bonney nor Love expressly teaches automatically creating different views for the sheets in response to a user command.

However, Kawai teaches *"the operator (i.e., user) can automatically create the exploded view based on the support by the computer"* (see p.4 par. 47). **(claim 5; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager automatically creates one or more different views for the Sheets in response to a user command).**

Examiner considers the exploded views illustrated in Figure 8 and Figure 9 to be the automatic created different views for the drawing sheet in Figure 7 (see Kawai Figures 7, 8, and 9). The **"All"** and **"first level"** buttons in Figure 7 generate the views in response to the user selecting the buttons (see Figure 7; ref. #35, ref. #36). The user can create the exploded view of the design in accordance with an exploded view creation command (see Kawai; par. 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to attach to Bonny communication bus line, an automatic creation device to automatically create the exploded view as taught by Kawai using the three-dimensional computer aided design application data as taught by Bonney and to display the exploded view as taught by Kawai of the list of views as taught by Love to provide the benefit of easily obtaining views automatically without the tedious troublesome of

additional drawing operations (see Bonney; Figure 2) (see Love; par. 2, par. 7) (see Kawai; par. 12 and par. 14).

Claim 6:

Bonney teaches *"hierarchical relationships between sheets can be created, modified and/or deleted by dragging and dropping icons displayed on display device 121"* (see col. 4 lines 45-49). **(claim 6; i.e., wherein the user command comprises a drag-and-drop operation.)** Examiner considers the dragging and dropping of icons to be a drag-and-drop operation by the user.

Claim 7:

Bonney teaches *"the sheet represented by icon 330 may have been stored in a separate file"* (see col. 6 lines 15-17). **(claim 7; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager creates a reference to a file containing the automatically created view.)** Examiner considers the icon serving as a reference to a separate file that contains a sheet. The sheet represents the automatically created view as explained in the rationale of claim 5.

Claim 8:

Neither Bonney nor Love expressly teaches a viewport displaying a geometric defined in the automatically created view.

However, Kawai Figure 5 illustrates a bounded area that is displaying a portion of the model space of the model, which is considered to be a viewport as defined by

applicant specification (see p. 7 lines 14-15). **(claim 8; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager creates a viewport displaying a geometric region defined in the automatically created view.)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to attach to Bonny communication bus line, an automatic creation device to create a viewport displaying a geometric region for the automatically created exploded view as taught by Kawai and to display the viewport of the list of views as taught by Love to provide the benefit of freely specifying the viewing direction of the viewport for the exploded view. Thus, the automatic exploded view can be displayed thru various predetermined viewports (see Bonney; Figure 2) (see Love; par. 2, par. 7) (see Kawai; p. 2 par. 30 and par. 33).

Claim 9:

Bonney teaches *"Fig. 2 is one embodiment of a computer system executing a CAD application program that generates objects of the drawing sheets of a design with a hierarchical relationship"* (see col. 3 lines 65-67). **(claim 9; i.e., wherein the automatically created view is placed in a hierarchical representation displayed on the computer.)** Examiner considers Figure 2 as an illustration of drawing sheets in a hierarchical representation on a computer display device (see Figure 2 ref# 121). The drawing sheet represents the automatically created view as explained in the rationale of claim 5.

Art Unit: 2176

Claim 10:

Bonney teaches *"a reverse update can also be provided. If field 420 of icon 440 is modified, field 420 of sheet 400 can be automatically updated. Automatic updates are not limited to fields within title blocks. Any field of component of sheet 400 can be linked to icon 440"* (see col. 6 lines 33-37). **(claim 10; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager places a label block associated with the automatically created view into the Sheet, with fields to display label information for the automatically created view, which updates automatically if the field's values change.)** Examiner considers the title block of the sheet to be a label block that contains fields that can be automatically updated when the corresponding icon field changes.

Claim 11:

Neither Bonney nor Love expressly allowing a user to adjust a scale of the automatically created view.

However, Kawai teaches *"the input screen 26 includes a space 27 for inputting the assembling position (i.e., reference position) and a space 28 for inputting the assembling direction (i.e., three-dimensional direction)"* (see par. 33). **(claim 11; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager allows a user to adjust a scale of the automatically created view.)** Examiner considers Kawai's Figure 5 as an illustration of the scale adjustment performed by the user at the input screen in Kawai's Figure 4.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to manage the views of the drawings generated by Bonney's

Art Unit: 2176

computer aided program with the list of views as taught by Love and to display an input screen to adjust the scale of a view as taught by Kawai to provide the benefit of the user predetermining the scale of the automatically created exploded view. Thus, the user has direct control over the change of positioning of parts constructed from the shape data.

(see Bonney; Figure 2 ref# 220) (see Love; par. 2, par. 7) (see Kawai; abstract, p. 2 par. 30 and par. 33)

Claims 16-22:

Claims 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22 are directed towards an apparatus and are substantially encompassed in method claims 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11, respectively, therefore the apparatus claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 above.

Claims 27-33:

Claims 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32 and 33 are directed towards manufacture claims and are substantially encompassed in method claims 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11, respectively, therefore the manufacture claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 above.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to amended independent claims 1, 12, and 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry Orr whose telephone number is (571) 270 1308. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8 to 4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on (571) 272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

6/26/2007

HO



Doug Hutton
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100